

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

 APPLICATION NO.
 FILING DATE
 FIRST NAMED INVENTOR
 ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

 08/766, 307
 12/13/96
 RIGGINS
 M
 564

MARC A. SOCKOL, ESQ.

GRAHAM & JAMES LLP

600 HANSEN WAY

PALO ALTO CA 94304-1043

EXAMINER GECKIL, M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 04/12/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks** 

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	1-1 1	7	Dist :	
Office Action Summary	08/766,307	//	Tark L	<u> </u>	Riggins	
Onice Action Summary	08/766,307 // Examiner Geckil		Group Art Unit 2756			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address						
Period for Response		5				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SEMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	TO EXPIRE 3 (Th	MONTH	(S) FROM T	ΉE		
<ul> <li>Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a</li> <li>If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by defau</li> <li>Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by</li> </ul>	response within the statuto t, expire SIX (6) MONTHS	ry minimum of thi from the mailing	rty (30) days w date of this cor	ill be nmur	considered timely.	
Status	1					
X Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/2	9/99					
☐ This action is FINAL.	'					
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except fo accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 (			he merits is	; clo	sed in	
Disposition of Claims						
Claim(s) 1-30 and 38-	50	is/are p	ending in the	app	olication.	
Of the above claim(s)						
☐ Claim(s)		is/are a	llowed.			
Claim(s) 1-30 and 18-50		is/are re	ejected.			
□ Claim(s)			is/are objected to.			
☐ Claim(s)————————————————————————————————————				tion	or election	
Application Papers		requirer	nent.			
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing F	Review, PTO-948.					
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is 🗆 approved	☐ disapproved				
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected	d to by the Examiner.					
$\hfill\Box$ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)						
<ul> <li>□ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority unde</li> <li>□ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the</li> <li>□ received.</li> <li>□ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number)</li> </ul>	e priority documents ha	ave been				
received in this national stage application from the Interr			•			
*Certified copies not received:			······································			
Attachment(s)						
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(	s)	nterview Summ	ary, PTO-41	3		
Notice of References Cited, PTO-892	•	□ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152				
□ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948		Other	•	•		

**Office Action Summary** 

Application/Control Number: 08/766,307

Art Unit:2756

- 1. Claims 1-30 and 38-50 are presented for examination.
- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-30 and 38-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cowan et al.
- 4. <u>Cowan et al</u> (5,828,840) taught the invention substantially as claimed (e.g., as in exemplary claim 1) including a system and method for communicating with a service (e.g., see column 5 lines 1-6, column 9 line 22 et seq and column 10 line 12 et seq), comprising:

  a) initiating a communications link between a browser stored on a client and a server (e.g., see
- column 2, columns 4-5 under the subtitle "Architecture", column 6 line 20 et seq and column 8 line 13 et seq);
- b) receiving selection of a service identifier from a set of service identifiers (e.g., see column 5 lines 20-30, column 6 line 20 et seq, column 7 line 3 et seq, and column 8 line 19 et seq);

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 08/766,307

Art Unit:2756

- c) receiving downloadable code corresponding to the selected service identifier (e.g., see column 5 line 1 et seq, column 6 line 20 et seq, and column 8 line 13 et seq);
- d) using the downloadable code to identify and initiate a network communications path from the browser to a service corresponding to the selected service identifier (e.g., see column 10 line 12 et seq and column 9 line 22 et seq); and
- e) using the downloadable code to interface with the service (e.g., see column 10 line 19 e t seq and column 11 line 1 et seq.) Cowan et al further taught, at the server, how to interface and forward financial transactions originating from the client to external upstream and database services and route the response back to the client (e.g., see column 10 lines 20 et seq.) What is more significant about Cowan et al reference is that at the server side they used SERVLETS to accomplis this interfacing (e.g., see columns 9-10) as well as using proxies (e.g., see column 9 line 21 et seq.) Other features are all obvious variations of the well known Internet art and they are rejected accordingly
- It would have been to one of ordinary skill in the Internet art at the time of the invention that the claimed invention differed only by a degree from the teachings of Cowan et al, e.g. in the downloadable code. Cowan et al did not call the applets as downloadable codes or downloadables but this is an obvious variation of the generic code which is downloaded by the server to the client (e.g., see column 5 line 1 et seq) and thus constitutes only difference in a degree. Examiner likes to point out that Cowan et al reference is an excellent reference close to

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 08/766,307

Art Unit:2756

a 102 in quality. Claims are ridiculously broad and reads on standard Internet practices. For

example dependent claims recite accessing URLs. Using URLs to access in the Internet is a

standard process.

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 and 38-50 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Mehmet Geckil whose telephone number is (703) 305-9676. The examiner

can normally be reached on all days of the week from 8:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

can be reached on (703)305-3817. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-9564.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Box AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

Art Unit:2756

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE")

Or:

(703) 308-5359 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2021 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

4/8/99

MEHMET B. GECKIL PRIMARY EXAMINER

Metit good